

## Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971  
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829  
GIF (Australia) = 0.564  
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912  
PIHHI (Russia) = 0.126  
ESJI (KZ) = 8.716  
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630  
PIF (India) = 1.940  
IBI (India) = 4.260  
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](https://doi.org/10.1/TAS) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](https://doi.org/10.15863/TAS)

## International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2020 Issue: 04 Volume: 84

Published: 30.04.2020 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



Zubayda Jumayeva

Jizzakh State Pedagogical Institute named after Abdulla Kadyri  
Senior lecturer

## LINGUO-CULTUROLOGICAL FEATURES OF ZOOMIMIC PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS IN UZBEK AND RUSSIAN LANGUAGES

**Abstract:** This article considers zoomimic units in Uzbek and Russian languages. The zoomorphisms involved as a component in the phraseology were compared. The examples were linguoculturologically analyzed.

**Key words:** zoomimics, linguoculturology, phraseology, component, phraseological confusion, totem concept, symbols, structure.

**Language:** English

**Citation:** Jumayeva, Z. (2020). Linguo-culturological features of zoomimic phraseological units in uzbek and russian languages. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 04 (84), 720-723.

**Soi:** <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-04-84-124> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2020.04.84.124>

**Scopus ASCC:** 1203

### Introduction

The whole being consists of the whole of three basic sub-worlds, such as the human, animal, and plant worlds. These small groups are constantly interacting and inextricably linked to each other. Animals have always played an important role in human life. Humans have used animals for different purposes, such as food, clothing, and various household chores. The role of animals in human life is also reflected in language, and animals are called by different names in different languages. Representatives of different nationalities also use animal names in a connotative sense, and lexemes representing animal names are also loaded with positive or negative meanings.

The phraseologies that reveal the character of each nation and the zoomorphisms that form part of them are of great help in the study of a particular nation. Zoonotic phraseologies have been referred to as zoomorphisms in linguistics since the 1960s. The issue of zoomorphisms has been studied by foreign and Uzbek linguists such as M. Zorrakuino, A. Kunin, M. Cheremesina, E. Kasitadze, E. Gutman, G. Khakimova, Z. Kholmonova.

Zoomorphisms form a unique layer in the language of each nation, in the richness of vocabulary, and serve to reveal to the reader more clearly the psyche, national color, shortcomings and qualities of society in a particular language. According to

linguists, zoomorphisms are also characterized by the representation of different human states.

Linguist A. Omonturdiev in his research on zoomorphisms expressed the following views: "It should be noted that the names of animals (horses, camels, oxen, sheep, rams, lions, tigers), which are the basis for the formation of proverbs, are characterized by greatness, justice, through names such as power, loyalty, courage, bravery, or, conversely, a donkey, a fox, a dog, a goat, and their characteristics, negative qualities such as ignorance, inferiority, incompetence, deceit, inhumanity are symbolically reflected. [ 8-3]

Zoomorphisms can be negative or positive:

- 1) Describe the appearance: *monkey face*;
- 2) Illumination of mental capacity: *chicken brain*;
- 3) describe the specific actions of man: walk like *bear*;
- 4) Demonstration of behavior: like a dog; [2 -47]

Research that began with the study of zoonymic words in different languages and their comparison later moved on to phraseology. As a result, the structural-semantic and grammatical aspects of phraseology containing animal names began to be studied separately.

The methods and principles proposed by O. Yusupov have theoretical and practical significance in the comparison of phraseological units. In his view,

## Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 4.971	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHHI (Russia)	= 0.126	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.716	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

first the corresponding (equivalent) and inappropriate (non-equivalent, alternative) phraseological units are identified. Phraseologisms that are equivalent in the native language and a foreign language are then distinguished and compared according to the following principles:

- semantics, figurativeness (metaphorization);
- the degree of redefinition of meaning;
- number of components;
- the order of placement of components;
- the method of expressing the syntactic connection;
- morphological word groups of components;
- subdivision of components;
- the components belong to the subject of the words;
- variability;
- how often (frequency of use).

The comparison of the above phraseologies is actually based on three major principles:

- lexical, semantic and stylistic aspects;
- grammatical aspect, ie morphological structure (to which word group the components belong) and syntactic connection;
- interrelationships, polysemic, synonymy, antonymy, variant relations and more or less use; [ 12-125]

At the turn of the century, phrases began to be studied as a separate branch of linguistics. Phrases consist of lexemes belonging to two or more independent or auxiliary word categories.

Phrases are linguistic units that have separate forms, are composed of specific components, interact with other parts of speech in speech, have a grammatical pointer, have a grammatical form.

When a zoonym becomes a component of a phraseological unit, it loses its lexical meaning, however, the zoonym implements the necessary character traits inherent in a person: movement activity, lifestyle, habits, appearance, imitation of sound.

Animals: fox - cunning and agility; wolf - greed and savagery; pig-greed; snake - cunning, malice, cruelty; bear - kindness, restlessness; lion-strength and independence; ant - labor; donkey-stupidity; the dog as a symbol of loyalty expressed this or that character, behavior of the person. The zoonymic component plays a very important role in revealing the essence of phraseology. [ 9 -90]

Although zoonimics component phraseologies have not been studied much, they do attract attention with their original meaning. One of the works on such phraseology was written by T.Shmelyova, devoted to the analysis of phraseological units with a zoonymic component in Russian and Bulgarian languages. In it, various features of zoonymic phraseological units are scientifically studied. When comparing phraseological units in Russian and Bulgarian, the scientist identifies geese, sheep, cows, chickens,

horses, cats, wolves, bears, mosquitoes, dogs, etc. as a separate "polyethalon" and divides them into three groups.

In the first group she compares the following synonymous phraseological units: *tihiy kak mysh* - as harmless as a mouse; *zatailsya kak mysh v nore* - to remain dumb; *powder in his mouth*; *pritiix kak mysh pod metley* - to be a mouse in a thousand coins.

The composition of the phraseology in the second group is mainly zoonyms composed of the names of domestic animals, some of the features of which are always compared to the people who look after (care for) them. For example: *rabotat kak lomovaya loshad* (work like a horse); *dyshat kak loshad* (breathe like a horse).

The third group of polyethalons includes the zoononym "sobaka" (dog) in Russian and Bulgarian, and they are shown to serve as reinforcing words in phraseology. In such comparative phrases, the original meaning of the zoonym component is lost, and it comes only as an element that enhances the character or action:

*Golodny kak sobaka* - very hungry; *zloy kak sobaka* - very evil, *ustat'kak sobaka* - very tired; *izbit kak sobaku* - bad beating.

The results of the analysis show that image-standards in different languages have different qualities and characteristics, the same zoonym may not participate in the function of the same meaning in both languages. Phraseologisms with a zoonymic component reflect the specific mentality of that language and that people, no matter what the language. [ 13-http]

Animals have always been the focus of humanity, and these expressions have not gone unnoticed. By observing the characteristics of animals, their habits were likened to those of man, and their behavior was compared to that of man. [ 4-5 3]

Zoonyms perform different functions in language, one of which is the figurative characteristic of a person. The basis of zoomorphic lexicon is the objective and subjective qualities of the animal. These qualities were invented by the "people's creative approach." In phraseology, which "focuses" on human characteristics, animal qualities, appearance, and behavior are transferred to human beings.

As a scholar who compares phraseological units in Russian and Uzbek, M. Khalikova compares phraseological units in two languages through semantic derevision and proves that phraseological nominations are directed to non-linguistic objects as a result of the emergence of portable meanings, so phraseological units often implement the same semantic formula in different languages. For example, the Russian *phraseology* " *bela ovtsa, sera ovtsa - odin ovechiy dux*" ( *white sheep, gray sheep - all are the spirit of a sheep* ) is semantically equivalent to the Uzbek phraseology " *white dog, black dog - all dog* ", but semantically and despite the syntactic equality, the

## Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971  
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829  
GIF (Australia) = 0.564  
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912  
PIHHI (Russia) = 0.126  
ESJI (KZ) = 8.716  
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630  
PIF (India) = 1.940  
IBI (India) = 4.260  
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

specificity of phraseological units is preserved. Both phrases use zoonim, but they “disappear” in phraseological units, the difference is insignificant and the meaning is transferred to the person. In both cases, the key word is "one" (odin), which promotes the same idea. In the Uzbek phraseological unit the zoonym is repeated, the structure of the phraseological unit in the Russian language is somewhat complicated: "odin ovechiy dux" (all is the spirit of a sheep). In this case it is based on the same semantic formula in both languages. [ 11-15]

Linguoculturologists V. Maslova and G. Alimjanova, comparing languages, prove that each language and culture has its own connotative content. The main reason for the formation of the primary connotative content is the meaning of the word itself, as it gives rise to the internal form for the figurative meaning. For example, Uzbek word “dog” as offensive as Russian word “pig”. In Russian, the pig is symbolized as follows: a) filth b) greed c) rudeness. As in other Muslim countries, in Uzbekistan the pork has a religious connotation, its meat has long been considered unclean [1-103] and not eaten. In the linguistic culture of the Turkic peoples, the word "pig" means insult. [7-54] It is well known that symbolic symbols and meanings were created before the totem, primarily in symbols and words. At the same time, zoomorphism, which is perceived as a totem, had a symbolic and verbal form in the thinking of a particular ethnos, and the ethnos accepted one or another aspect of it and brought it to the level of a god and a symbol. The qualities of animals were transferred to humans and they were considered people with a certain position in the society in which they lived. Totem animals are considered sacred. It can be seen that this custom exists in the beliefs of all the peoples of the world. For example, in India *cows*, *monkeys*, *elephants*, *kangaroos* in Australia, *jaguars* in Mexico, and *bears* in Russia are animals of special reverence, and in past it was considered an honor for a person to be named after these animals. Animals and birds such as *wolves*, *camels*, *horses*, *swallows*, *eagles* were revered by our ancestors. For example: *Mouse* zoometaphor or *harmless* phraseological unit the development of the national culture as a unique concept in his innocence feature is based on the observation that our ancestors came from. "In this way, the “mouse” phraseological unit has gained the status of a national image as an Uzbek measure of innocence. [ 2-15]

Russian and Uzbek languages, phraseological units semantics analogues in comparison zoonimic component may find a lot of turns of units: "**My aunt's calf**" - "**Wet chicken**", "**The calf ran to the hayloft**" - "**Zayachiy pryjok - tri shaga**", "**Yot tavukday**" - "**Belaya vorona**", "**Mulla mingan**

**eshakday**" - "**Ovechiy nray**", "**Smirnee telyonka**", "**Like a Burnt Chicken**" - "**Kak ugorelaya koshka**", "**Known as a horse's bridle**" - "**Znayut vse, kak ryabuyu sobaku**", "**Making an elephant from a fly**" - "**Iz bloxi delayut verblyuda**", "**Watching a fly**", "**How much is a camel - how much is fat**" - "**A great elephant and a great injury**" ...

As above example shows, analog zoomorphic are different, even if the semantics used in the framework of an idea. Such examples can be found not only in phraseological units with zoomorphic symbols, but also in phraseological units that contain other symbols.

Mythological legends, proverbs and sayings about the origin of animals are widespread in Uzbek linguistics, and although oral prose works on this topic have not been studied separately, various sources provide information about this or that animal.

Well-known scientist H. Zarifov's article on the comparative study of folklore and archeological materials analyzes the totemistic legend of the Uzbek wolf. [2 -15]

Phrases that express negative meanings are formed by symbolizing lexemes that represent the names of wild animals. He declared negative features of character-based "**snake is under the earth**" phrazema formed and represents the sensitive nature of the people.

Although the phrasal activity of lexemes representing the names of animals is not high, it should be noted that their use in speech is much higher. [ 10-84]

Phraseologisms with a zoonymic component play an important role among phraseologies, and they play an important role in the structure of phraseological units. The presence of lexemes represented by zoonyms in phraseological structures indicates that a particular phraseology expresses its relation to them. Typically, each animal, insect, or bird is distinguished by some unique characteristics. For example, if ants and bees are symbols of diligence, a lion is a symbol of courage and a rabbit is a symbol of caution.

In general, zoomorphisms have an evaluative property in both languages because they describe a person positively or negatively. Assessment helps to create a figurative description of a person based on zoomorphism. The object of zoomorphical phraseology is human. The associative-figurative theme for metaphor is connected with national-cultural norms, stereotypes, formed on the basis of language speakers' perception and imagination of the world. Phraseological units with zoomorphism exist in all languages and have different semantic meanings in different languages.

**Impact Factor:**

<b>ISRA (India)</b>	<b>= 4.971</b>	<b>SIS (USA)</b>	<b>= 0.912</b>	<b>ICV (Poland)</b>	<b>= 6.630</b>
<b>ISI (Dubai, UAE)</b>	<b>= 0.829</b>	<b>PIHHI (Russia)</b>	<b>= 0.126</b>	<b>PIF (India)</b>	<b>= 1.940</b>
<b>GIF (Australia)</b>	<b>= 0.564</b>	<b>ESJI (KZ)</b>	<b>= 8.716</b>	<b>IBI (India)</b>	<b>= 4.260</b>
<b>JIF</b>	<b>= 1.500</b>	<b>SJIF (Morocco)</b>	<b>= 5.667</b>	<b>OAJI (USA)</b>	<b>= 0.350</b>

**References:**

1. Alimjanova, G.M. (n.d.). *Comparative phraseology*, p-103.
2. Baxronova, D.K. (2015). On the semantic features and translations of the Spanish zoomorphisms "Perro" and "Mono". *Journal of Language and Literature Education*, 2-issue, p.47.
3. Bakhronova, D.K. (2017). *Semantic and lingvoculturological features of anthropozoomorphisms*. Autoref.dis. (PhD). (p.15). Tashkent.
4. Ermakova, E.N., & Fayzullina, G.Ch. (2016). *Phraseologisms with a component of naming the cow as a marker of the mentality of the people*. (p.53). Kazan: Izd -vo Kazan.
5. Jumaeva, Z. (2015). *Use of phrases with zoonym component*. General philological researches: problems and solutions. (pp.106-107). Jizzakh.
6. Zarifov, H. (1958). On the comparative study of folklore and archeological materials. *Uzbek language and literature*,1, pp.25-30.
7. Maslova, V.A. (2001). *Lingvokulturologiya*. Uchebnoe posobie dlya studentov vysshix uchebnyx zavedeniy. (p.54). Moscow: Izd.Tsentr "Akademiya".
8. (2007). *Omonturdiyev. The name of household items and euphemisms of proverbs in the speech of A. Chorvador*. Termez. B-3.
9. Sokur, E.A., & Sheojeva, B.A. (2018). The role of the zoonima component in the formation of the individual meaning of phraseology. *Vestnik AGU*, Vypusk 4 (227), p.90.
10. Snesaryov, G.P. (1969). *Relikty domusulmanskix verovaniy i obryadov u uzbekov Khorezma*. Moscow: Nauka.
11. Xalikova, M.K. (1999). *Phraseology as a form of reflection of the national mentality in the written picture of the world (on the material of Russian and Uzbek languages)* Author's abstract.Tashkent.
12. (2007). *Yusupov. Teoriticheskie osnov sopostavitel'noy Linguistics*. Tashkent: Fan.
13. Shmelyova, T.M. (1996). *Sushchestvitel'nye polietalony v angliyskix ustoychivykh sravneniyax. Aktualnye problemy psicholingvistiki.Tver.* Retrieved from <http://www/tsu.tmn.ru/>